

To Whom it may Concern,

Wallarrah 2 Coal Project SSD 4974 Amended Development Application.

I wish to object to the current Amended Development Application (ADA) on exhibition for the Wallarah 2 Coal proposal and also to the further progression of the mine proposal itself. I request a response to my concerns listed below.

The application portrays the economic benefits and job figures for the whole project and does not confine itself clearly to this Amendment alone.

From research I have discovered that the proponent KORES is withdrawing from overseas development due to massive debt ratios as recently expressed in the Korean press. This tells me and our community that the future job prospects, development and most importantly environmental repair, compensation and rehabilitation alluded to by KORES have little hope of being realised. It also indicates that KORES will desperately pursue the passing of the amendment using any means at its disposal with the intention of selling it to a third party to recover losses. In this context Kores will say and do anything to get the amendment passed and residents of the Central Coast will have to live in hope that the buyer commits to what Kores signed off on.

POINTS OF OBJECTION

Costs/Benefits

The Amended Development Application (ADA, page 85) states that the royalties to the State, over the proposed 28 years life of the mine, are \$200 Million, which equates to just over \$7 million per annum. I would contend that with falling coal prices, and then taking into consideration Government concessional rebates to coal companies, this figure is highly inflated. Furthermore if the costs of repair and rehabilitation are taken into account, particularly in the Jilliby Valley water catchment and Hue Hue subdivisions following subsidence, they easily negate the benefits to the State and local authorities. By adding the long term cost to public health and to greater airborne diseases in the population it begins to look like a costly enterprise in both negative health impacts and real dollar terms for the public purse. Confidential draft conditions circulating through Planning Dept of “second workings” of coal seams would mean further and greater subsidence over time.

I don't believe the ADA addresses the number of working professionals who located to the area(specifically Blue Haven) for its quiet semi-rural aspects and quality of air. All of

these will be rudely taken away if the ADA is approved. In public and private meetings involving Blue Haven residents I have had discussions with literally hundreds of 'heads of families' who not only intend to relocate to a different area if the mine is approved BUT also will remember that it was promised (before the last State election) by the Liberal Government that this mine would not go ahead. At the next elections they will vote accordingly to hold the Liberal government accountable by remembering who forced them into an unwanted and highly disruptive relocation of their families. Politics is a numbers game and so is social media and in considering approving this mine you are also considering making the mistake of providing large numbers of angry people a prime example of the most popular and most shared content on the internet. The mistake would be making a very unpopular decision affecting thousands of innocent families who now have a way to complain about this to literally millions of others through social media. In stating this I am just pointing out some more unaddressed risks of this mine proposal for the government if this amended development application is approved as it WILL activate many to action. Especially those Blue Haven families who are NOT in a position to be able to move from the area and who will be outraged and incensed at the peril and danger their families will have thrust upon them completely against their will if the ADA is approved. There seems to be something elemental and raw triggered when you mess with a person's land or the environment in which they live and I thought this lesson would have already been well and truly learnt by the government from history.

Employment

Pages 86 and 87 of the ADA state job creation beginning with 79 through to direct and indirect job figures in year 2 of 1,111 jobs. This application states very clearly that this assessment is only looking at this Amendment and not the whole Project yet the job figures are obviously being included for the whole project such as a larger "intersectoral linkages" job quotation during construction of 1605 direct and indirect jobs. This is another example where the ADA contains inaccuracies and should be rejected.

Because the original rail spur is not being built and will be replaced by a conveyor system (essentially being the main thrust of this Amendment) it does not create an additional 1605 jobs for the whole Project as configured above. As in the original EIS the job prospects are not defined and again highly inflated and misleading. The ADA should be rejected based on this point alone and I would like an answer as to why this has not happened.

Dust and Health and Noise

Dust remains a real issue for health in the Blue Haven and Wyee precincts despite partial coverage of infrastructure. There is no attempt to cover coal wagons which will travel through the southern suburbs to Newcastle affecting all those communities of southern Lake Macquarie and Newcastle as has been demonstrated in the Hunter to Port line. There has been great concern about the mapping of coal dust and the lack of authorities to control those emissions. This project exacerbates the problem adding to that congestion toward the Newcastle terminal. The added times of daily rail crossing closures at Adamstown and Islington need to be disclosed to the Newcastle community.

Pm10 emissions from the site are conservative and do not take into account the changing nature of intense wind and storm events in the recent years. BlueHaven and Wyee

townships are now as close as 200 and 400 metres respectively from the new proposal bringing even greater problems for families in the area for both constant dust and noise 24 h/per day. There are many schools, pre-schools and establishments within 5 kms of the facility and they will suffer from emissions from the site. This will be added to the negative effect of the coal dust. This is unacceptable and will get the most attention from social (and mainstream) media forums creating a massive groundswell of negativity for the government for effectively sentencing a generation of Blue Haven school children to degenerative respiratory diseases and early painful deaths. The share rate for these stories will be incredibly high.

Please refer back to the submission by Dr. Peter Lewis, Area Director of Public Health for North Sydney and the Central Coast wherein he outlines greater risks to children and health sufferers in this region should this project be approved.

The ADA admits to noise exceeding acceptable limits for “residences to the north of Bushells Ridge Road at Wyee” and general noise 24 h/per day for those living in Blue Haven and Wyee areas are major issues of concern for residents of Blue Haven like myself. This is an **Unresolved** issue from the EIS 2014. It is also unacceptable. What is the management plan for this?

This noise pollution will negatively impact on a large number of shift workers who reside in Blue Haven and who work at the many local Clubs, Aged Care facilities and Wyong Hospital. The noise, being a 24 hour a day issue, will also impact on all the normal hours workers and be a constant source of dissatisfaction and complaint. There will be plenty of people who will remember who created this disaster (by passing the ADA) for those affected and remind them of who NOT to vote for at the next elections.

Massive subsidence figures represented in the proponents EIS affect 245 homes and their infrastructure, 86 of which are destined to suffer a metre or more drop right up to 2.3 metres and the valley floor suffering subsidence up to 1.8 metres fall right up to 2.6 metres near the Jilliby Conservation Area provokes “**inevitable uncertainty concerning subsidence predictions**” as a **PAC principal finding**. The regular flooding of the Jilliby Valley means that this proposal condemns the area to degradation and to long periods of separation from facilities and emergency services.

The performance of the Mine Subsidence Board in refusing the vast majority of claims Statewide for subsidence year in, year out does not protect residents as is claimed in the application.

“The project predicts risk of reduced availability of water for the Central Coast Water Supply” according to the PAC wherein they... ” recommended there should be no net impact on potential catchment yield” .The Central Coast water catchment supply in the Wyong valleys is at real risk of destruction due to massive subsidence and loss of potable water to the mine area below. What protections are in place for our water supply?

Senior Office of Env. And Heritage (OEHL) diverted plans to have an air monitor installed at Wyee and placed in an out-of-influence area at Wyong Racecourse thereby distorting air quality readings for the region. Appendix C from the consultants (pages 2 and 3) says,

“Fugitive emissions can be expected during operation from loading stockpile to conveyor, wind erosion and maintenance of stockpiles and from upcast ventilation shafts”

5270 cubic metres per year of semi-solid salt waste for at least 14 years into underground storage and capacity and salty brine discharges into the Wallarah Creek system and OEH have grave concerns about the “ ultimate fate of the supersaturated salt solution remains unclear”

The consultant’s(MER) suggestion that “after more than 500 years, water levels in the workings (in the Jilliby Creek/Wyong creek catchment)are predicted to have recovered(and not be of concern)” reads like a horror story to residents in the area. These undoubtedly glib sounding ‘snippets’ will be broadcast widely and frequently to emphasise the ineptness of the governments decision making if the ADA is approved.

The Mine Subsidence Board has accepted only about a quarter of claims over the last ten years and will fight any great expense claimed by those who suffer subsidence. Also only the house itself is covered, while sheds, fences pools etc are exempt from claims. Many families stand to lose significant assets if the ADA is approved and will also be very vocal in the social media and standard press about this.

Walarah 2 have failed continually to consult with any of the people directly affected by the proposal. They have failed to hold any open public meeting explaining the project. Wallarah 2 have failed to bring to the public any concept drawing of the new conveyor system and loading facility near Blue Haven. How can the ADA be approved without this happening?

This Amendment should be rejected and the whole project put aside due to the numerous areas of risk, especially to the health and wellbeing of nearby residents, and the many inaccuracies in the application. As stated at the start of this letter I request a response to my concerns.

Yours faithfully

Garry Malone, CCM

7 Barwon Close

Blue Haven, NSW

Mobil: 0435 443 938